

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,320	01/23/2004	Aniello Costagliola	Costagliola=1	4943
7.	590 06/03/2004		EXAM	INER
Robert DeWitty			PETRUNCIO, JOHN M	
c/o Outsource Product Manufacture LLC Ste. 2700, #107			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
111 S. Calvert Street			1751	
Baltimore, MD 21201			DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/762,320	COSTAGLIOLA, ANIELLO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John M Petruncio	1751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19</u> is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-11,14-18 and 20</u> is/are rejected.) Claim(s) <u>1-11,14-18 and 20</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>12 and 13</u> is/are objected to.	_					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∭ Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da	PTO-413) te				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1.		atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification disclosure at page nine, line 15 as to the terms "sodium tetrashydrate" and "sodium monohydrate" as suitable bleaching compounds is questioned.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-11, 14-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an oxygen bleach including sodium percarbonate, does not reasonably provide enablement for any "bleach" including hypochlorites. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. ***.
- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claim's 8-10 recite the limitation ""commercially available detergent"". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims as a surfactant is called for. Additionally, the definition of a surfactant in terms of a commercially available detergent

Art Unit: 1751

comprising 'surfactants" and other components renders the claims vague and indefinite..

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-11 and 14-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat 4,793,942 to Lokkesmoe et al_kUS Pat. 4,164,477 to Whitley.

The Loekkesmoe et al patent discloses a detersive system comprising a hypohalite construed as a bleach (col. 8, line 56 et seq), a surfacatant (col. 7, line 20 et seq0 and an acid including acetic acid (col. 5, line 68) in an aqueous medium. Simillarly, the Whitley '477 patent relates to a fungicidal detergent composition and discloses the combination of water, organic acid such as acetic acid, at least one surfactant and a hypochlorite (see e.g., claims one and three). To the extent that these references do not explicitly call for a vinegar, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the benefit of these references, would recognize the equivalency of vinegar and acetic acid, the primary substituent of vinegar, and would have found it obvious and motivated to substitute vinegar for the acetic acid of the references' compositions for their intended purposes.

8. Claim 19 is allowed.

9. Claims 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. ***.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Petruncio whose telephone number is (571) 272-1323. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from ~9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/762,320

Art Unit: 1751

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John M. Petruncio June 1, 2004

GREGORY DELCOTTO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MILLIAN

MILL

Page 5